

1 P. Kristofer Strojnik, SBN 242728  
2 psstrojnik@strojniklaw.com  
3 Esplanade Center III, Suite 700  
4 2415 East Camelback Road  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
415-450-0100 (tel.)

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff

6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

9 THERESA BROOKE, a married woman  
10 dealing with her sole and separate claim,

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 HARBORSIDE INNS OF SANTA  
14 BARBARA INC., a California corporation,

15 Defendant.

Case No:

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT**

**(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)**

16 Plaintiff alleges:

17 **PARTIES**

18 1. Plaintiff Theresa Brooke is a married woman. Plaintiff is legally disabled,  
19 and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2),  
20 the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 et seq., the  
21 California Unruh Civil Rights Act. Plaintiff ambulates with the aid of a wheelchair due  
22 to the loss of a leg.

23 2. Defendant, Harborside Inns of Santa Barbara Inc., owns and/or operates  
24 and does business as the hotel Brisas del Mar, Inn at the Beach, located at 223 Castillo  
25 Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101. Defendant's hotel is a public accommodation  
26 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(A), which offers public lodging services. On  
27 information and belief, Defendant's hotel was built or renovated after March 15, 2012.  
28

## **JURISDICTION**

2       3.      Jurisdiction in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 42  
3 U.S.C. § 12188.

4       4. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and  
5 Defendant does substantial business in this judicial district.

6       5.     Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) and (c)  
7 in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions  
8 giving rise to the claims occurred.

9       6. Pursuant to *Arroyo v. Rosas*, supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate over  
10 Plaintiff's Unruh claim. On a case-specific analysis, there are no compelling reasons to  
11 decline jurisdiction.

## ALLEGATIONS

13       7. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's hotel's disabled parking is not the  
14 shortest possible route to the Hotel lobby entrance. Section 208.3.1.

15        8.      Disabled parking spots relate to Plaintiff's disability because she has only  
16 one leg and uses a wheelchair, and disabled parking provides for an access aisle and  
17 closer distances to an accessible entrance.

18        9. It is more difficult for a person in a wheelchair to move about than a  
19 person who is able to walk; it is also more time-consuming. Hence, disabled parking  
20 spots must be the closest to the building entrance to counter-act the difficulty and extra  
21 time, i.e. make things equal.

22       10. Plaintiff formerly worked in the hospitality industry. She is an avid  
23 traveler across California for purposes of leisure travel and to “test” whether various  
24 hotels comply with disability access laws, doing so at least once per month. Testing is  
25 encouraged by the Ninth Circuit.

26       11.    In early June 2025, Plaintiff visited Defendant's hotel, which has a  
27 parking lot. However, the disabled parking spots were not the shortest distance to the  
28 lobby entrance, which is required pursuant to Section 208.3 of the Standards. The

1 Hotel's non-disabled parking spots are much closer to the entrance. As a result of the  
2 violation that she personally encountered (disabled parking not shortest route to  
3 entrance), she was deterred from entering the Hotel lobby.

4           12. Deterred, but before leaving, she also personally observed that  
5 Defendant's Hotel Jacuzzi is completely inaccessible to her. The Jacuzzi does not have  
6 an accessible means of entry for a mobility-impaired person, such as a pool lift. Plaintiff  
7 was further deterred by her inability to access the Jacuzzi.

8       13. Plaintiff has certain plans of returning and staying at the Hotel in October  
9 2025 during one of her many trips across Southern California, in the hopes that  
10 Defendant will have remediated the barrier by then thereby allowing her full and equal  
11 access. If the barrier is not removed by the time of her return, she will remain deterred.

14. It is readily achievable and inexpensive to modify the Hotel to move a  
disabled parking spot to the shortest possible route to the lobby entrance.

14 15. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff and others will continue to be unable to  
15 independently use Defendant's hotel in violation of her rights under the ADA.

## **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 16. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.

17. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has  
18 failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable  
19 by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and §  
20 121282(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.  
21

18. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to  
remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and  
independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C.  
§12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the  
2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging  
services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.

1       19. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's Hotel parking lot does not  
2 comply with Section 208.3 of the Standards, as described above.

3       20. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards,  
4 as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id.* Readily achievable  
5 means that providing access is easily accomplishable without significant difficulty or  
6 expense.

7       21. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and Plaintiff invokes her statutory right  
8 to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

9       22. Without the requested injunctive relief, Defendant's non-compliance with  
10 the ADA's requirements that its parking lot be fully accessible to, and independently  
11 useable by, disabled people is likely to recur.

12       WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 13       a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant  
14       was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA  
15       described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA;
- 16       b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR §  
17       36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its  
18       parking lot into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the  
19       ADA;
- 20       c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;
- 21       d. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and  
22       appropriate.

23       **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24       23. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.

25       24. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has  
26       failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable  
27       by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and §  
28       121282(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.

1       25. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to  
2 remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and  
3 independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C.  
4 §12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the  
5 2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging  
6 services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.

7       26. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's hotel swimming pool and  
8 Jacuzzi does not have a pool lift or other means of accessible entry for a mobility-  
9 impaired person in violation of Section 242.2 of the Standards.

10       27. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards,  
11 as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id.* Readily achievable  
12 means that providing access is easily accomplishable without significant difficulty or  
13 expense.

14       28. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and Plaintiff invokes her statutory right  
15 to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

16       29. Without the requested injunctive relief, Defendant's non-compliance with  
17 the ADA's requirements that its Jacuzzi be fully accessible to, and independently  
18 useable by, disabled people is likely to recur.

19       WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 20       a. DECLARATORY Judgment that at the commencement of this action  
21           Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the  
22           ADA described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the  
23           ADA;
- 24       b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR §  
25           36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its  
26           Jacuzzi into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA;
- 27       c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;
- 28       d. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and  
          appropriate.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

30. Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth.

31. Defendant has violated the Unruh by denying Plaintiff equal access to its public accommodation on the basis of her disability as outlined above.

32. Unruh provides for declaratory and monetary relief to “aggrieved persons” who suffer from discrimination on the basis of their disability.

33. Plaintiff has been damaged by the Defendant's non-compliance with Unruh.

34. Pursuant to Cal Civ. Code §52, Plaintiff is further entitled to such other relief as the Court considers appropriate, including monetary damages in an amount of \$4,000.00, and not more.

35. Pursuant to Unruh, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees and costs in an amount to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Unruh; and
- b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR § 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its parking lot and Jacuzzi into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA;
- c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;
- d. Damages in the amount of \$8,000.00; and
- e. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and appropriate.

## DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on issues triable by a jury.

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025.  
2  
3



4 \_\_\_\_\_  
5 P. Kristofer Strojnik (242728)  
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff

7 **VERIFICATION**  
8

9 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.  
10  
11

12 DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025.  
13



14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 Theresa Marie Brooke  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28